## **EXHIBIT D**

yet and/or -- I didn't make the presentation. Colonel McAllister did because I had nothing to do with the formation of the budget. Somebody could probably give you that date when the budget presentation was made for public safety.

But my understanding, as time went on, was that the number of positions in public safety is a factor in determining whether or not sufficient monies are placed into the personnel line, and that the numbers are only critical leading up to the passage of the budget. And once the budget passes -- and I guess this is county wide because, again, I still have trouble understanding this way of doing business -- but that once the budget passes, the numbers become immaterial and it's the money that you have. And it's based upon the money as to whether or not you can over fill, over promote, whatever you want to do.

As long as you have the money within the department, you are permitted to make those kind of adjustments at any point in the budget year, which is what I understand occurred in December. In the fiscal year, '05, budget, there were 36 sergeants. And the colonel decided to go to 38 and promoted two additional sergeants in December of '04. The budget that passed for

'06 included 38 sergeants.

And by the time June 29th arrived and I issued this memorandum, I had heard from many, many sources, both internal and external, that the most critical need in the police department, at that point, was for patrol officers. And this was given the fact that we had 12 vacancies at that point in time. We were not going to start in academy until, at the earliest, November or December. And that eventually got pushed off until March. And that we could ill afford to lose more patrol officers.

Throughout my first two or three months, the CAO and I discussed this. And my recommendation to him was that, at least for the time-being, we not fill the 37th and 38th position. And we were in the process of attempting to secure a contract to follow up on the Southern Institute Study that had been conducted in 2000. It was our intent, as part of that process, to have whoever won the contract look at the authorized strength of the department and the strength within each of the ranks in the department. And that was the second reason that I didn't feel it was appropriate to move forward with the two additional positions until we had that report in hand.

1 | 1st of the fiscal year. And, at some point, it came 2 | around to me. And I said that is my intention.

- Q. And you communicated that intention?
- A. I did.

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. To the people who were --
- 6 A. In attendance.
  - Q. And they included those who stood to be promoted?
  - A. That's correct.
  - Q. So you made that statement to them that that was your intention?
- 11 A. And that was in mid May. Exact date, I can't 12 remember now.
  - Q. And then it was on June 29 by way of memo that you decided not to make those promotions?
  - A. After consulting with the CAO and receiving his concurrence, I issued this memo saying that we would not. I met with those same parties -- it wasn't everyone that attended the first meeting, but I met with the same group of officers in my office. I believe it was that afternoon. I apologized for my statement in May. I told them that I had learned more information since then, that it had changed the backdrop against which I had originally intended to make those promotions and that, at this point, would not be move forward with the additional

1.3

And I made that statement because, in my experience with the Wilmington Police Department, in all the training that I had as a sergeant and as a manager, you always take responsibility for the bad news and you always share the good news. And I didn't want to leave any doubt in the officer's mind in that meeting that this was something that the colonel had embraced.

Having said that, the chief administrative officer was fully aware of the memo that was going to be sent out. And I say that because when I met with him on the 29th, before or after we had this discussion with Allison Levine, I previewed the draft language I was going to use in this memo. And he thought that it should be shorter and more succinct. And I made those changes before issuing that memo that afternoon.

- Q. I'm sorry. What does this have to do with Allison Levine? I missed that.
- A. I'm just saying that it occurred the same day on the 29th. So at some point as we are trying to work through that, we discussed the memorandum that I was going to issue on the sergeants' positions. He looked at it, offered some amendments, and I incorporated those amendments into the memo that was handed to Colonel McAllister later that day.

- Q. As I understand it, I think you have so testified -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- when you met with these officers who were to find out that they were not going to be promoted, at least at that point, you told them that it was your decision and your decision only?
- A. That's correct. The message I was trying to impart was that this was coming from me and not the colonel. I didn't want the colonel to, in any way, be blamed for this. He fought hard and vigorously to preserve these two positions. And it was only after what I learned between joining the county April the 18th and my recommendation to the CAO on June the 29th that we not proceed with those two promotions, that we made the final decision. I didn't want any of the officers thinking that it was their chief undercutting them.
- Q. As I think I understand, you met with the CAO before you issued this memo. You said he helped edit the memo for you?
  - A. That's correct.

- Q. And so that decision was made on June 29th; it was not made before that?
  - A. That's correct.
  - Q. Is there any reason why Allison Levine knew about

2.2

One of the other factors that I was struggling with at that point was, probably the third or fourth week in, I'm told we have a \$500,000 deficit in the department of public safety. And I told the colonel that I was having some real problems with promoting the 37th and 38th sergeant until after the 1st of the fiscal year because there wasn't money for it in the budget. We were broke. We had to have a special appropriation of about 500, \$600,000 to get through the end of the fiscal year.

He argued that it wasn't that much more money. And I said I understand that. It's probably only \$1,500, \$2,300 at most per officer. But it's the principle of the thing. We are already \$500,000 in the hole. I can't, in good conscience, promote the 37th and 38th sergeant until after the 1st of the fiscal year.

At that point, he indicated that we would just wait and do all three after the 1st of the fiscal year. That happens prior to the meeting with the FOP members on about the 17th or 18th, which is when we tell them that the promotions will occur after the 1st of the fiscal year.

Q. Now, isn't it fair to say that the county was paying acting sergeants during this time period?

- It's your testimony that the chief of police runs Ο. the New Castle County Police Department?
  - Α. Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- And in that capacity, does transfers, promotions, Q. that type of thing?
  - Α. Yes.
- 12 Q. Troop assignments?
  - The functions that were prescribed in Title 9. Now, that was the scheme up until November when an ordinance was passed that delineated the responsibilities and authority of the director of public safety. that changed somewhat.

Prior to that, I knew that any power or authority or responsibility that I had flowed through the And that's one of the reasons that we were in such CAO. close contact on issues, that if there was something critical that I needed to do, particularly in police. The same issues did not present themselves in paramedic, 911 or in OEM because there were not these Title 9